
 <p><b>TRANSMITTAL FORM</b></p> <p>(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)</p>	Application Number	09/656,084
	Filing Date	September 6, 2000
	First Named Inventor	Barry N. KREISWIRTH et al.
	Art Unit	1631
	Examiner Name	Mary K. Zeman
Attorney Docket Number		419124-0002

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Petition to the Director Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.181(a) to Reset the Period for Reply Due to Late Receipt of an Office Action with Exhibits A-C  <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached  <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply (pgs).  <input type="checkbox"/> After Final  <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)  <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request  <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request  <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement  <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)  <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application  <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Formal Drawing(s) ( sheets)  <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers  <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Correct Inventorship  <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application  <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address  <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer  <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund  <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____  <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC  <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences  <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)  <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information  <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter  <input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">Remarks</div>		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT			
Firm	Bingham McCutchen LLP		
Signature			
Printed Name	Erin M. Dunston		
Date	April 19, 2007	Reg. No.	51,147

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.			
Signature			
Typed or printed name		Date	

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of	)	MAIL STOP AF
	)	
Barry N. Kreiswirth <i>et al.</i>	)	Group Art Unit: 1631
	)	
Application No.: 09/656,084	)	Examiner: Mary K. ZEMAN
	)	
Filed: September 6, 2000	)	Confirmation No.: 8869
	)	
For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR	)	MAIL STOP AF
TRACKING AND CONTROLLING	)	
INFECTIONS	)	

**PETITION TO THE DIRECTOR PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.181(a)**  
**TO RESET THE PERIOD FOR REPLY**  
**DUE TO LATE RECEIPT OF AN OFFICE ACTION**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.181(a) and Manual of Patent Examining Procedure §§ 710.06(II) and 1002.02(c)(3)(i), Applicants hereby petition to the Director to reset the period for reply to the Final Office Action issued in the above-identified case.

Attached Exhibit A is a Final Office Action issued in the above-identified case purportedly mailed on February 5, 2007 ("the Final Office Action"). The Final Office Action set a shortened statutory period for reply of three (3) months, *i.e.*, the first deadline for responding to the Final Office Action is currently set for May 5, 2007.

Applicants did not receive the Final Office Action until April 13, 2007, as reflected by the "RECEIVED APRIL 13 2007" stamp from Applicants' representatives' firm, Bingham McCutchen, LLP marked on the Final Office Action. *See Exhibit B.*

Records listed by the Patent and Trademark Office's Public PAIR system reflect that while the Final Office Action may have been mailed on February 2, 2007, it was "returned to

USPTO as undelivered” on February 12, 2007. *See Exhibit C.* Pursuant to Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 710.06, the Final Office Action should have received a new date of mailing when it was mailed the second, successful, time.

Because more than two (2) of the shortened three (3) month statutory period for reply had already elapsed by the time Applicants’ representatives received the Final Office Action, Applicants respectfully request that the period for reply be reset to reflect receipt of the Final Office Action on April 13, 2007.

Pursuant to Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 710.06, this Petition is being filed within two weeks of receipt of the Final Office Action. Pursuant to Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 1002.02(c), Applicants believe this Petition will be decided by the Technology Center Director.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the period for reply to the Final Office Action be reset.


In the event that there are any questions relating to this Petition to the Direction Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.181(a) to Reset the Period for Reply Due to Late Receipt of an Office Action, or to the application in general, it would be appreciated if the Examiner would contact Applicants' undersigned attorney by telephone at (202) 373-6000 so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-4047.

Respectfully submitted,  
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN, LLP

Date: April 19, 2007

By:

  
Erin M. Dunston  
Registration No. 51,147

Bingham McCutchen LLP  
Three Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, California 94111-4067  
Local Telephone: (202) 373-6000  
Local Facsimile: (202) 373-6001

# EXHIBIT A




UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*[Signature]*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/656,084	09/06/2000	Barry N. Kreiswirth	19124.0002	8869
23517 7590 02/05/2007 BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP 3000 K STREET, NW BOX 1P WASHINGTON, DC 20007			EXAMINER ZEMAN, MARY K	
			ART UNIT 1631	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE 3 MONTHS			MAIL DATE 02/05/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.





# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/656,084

Applicant(s)

KREISWIRTH ET AL.

Examiner

Mary K. Zeman

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-14, 16, 17, 21-36, 38 and 42-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-14, 16, 17, 21-36, 38 and 42-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's arguments filed 9/28/06 have been entered and fully considered.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-14, 16, 17, 21-36, 38 and 42-44 are pending in this application.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 32, 33, 34-36 38 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant's argue that they choose not to be bound to any definition of the term remote in the context of the rejected claims. These arguments to do provide clear boundaries of what is claimed. The examiner offered multiple definitions for the term which cannot all exist in one system at the same time. MPEP 2173: "when there is more than one definition for a term, it is incumbent upon applicant to make clear which definition is being relied upon to claim the invention. Until the meaning of a term or phrase used in a claim is clear, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is appropriate." "remote" is a variable term and it is unclear how far apart the parts must be to satisfy the claim limitations.

Applicant's arguments do not address how the remote facility is to obtain the samples. How does a facility take samples from a patient? It would appear that individuals or health care workers *within* a facility would take the samples, and not the remote facility itself, and not the claimed system. A system is an interlinked set of physical elements such as a computer, display and output; or article of manufacture and controller.

Similarly, the metes and bounds of the term "remote" in claims 34 -36 are unclear. At what point is the facility remote from where the sequencing is performed? On a different table? In a different room? In a different building?



Art Unit: 1631

Applicant's arguments with regards to claim 33 are incorrect. The claim is not drawn to a system, but to software code stored on a computer readable media. The metes and bounds of the software code of claim 33 are unclear. How does a software code obtain samples from a patient? Software code cannot physically obtain a sample. Further, software code cannot sequence a sample.

It is unclear how the limitation of claim 44 further limits the system of claim 32. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive, as a method limitation does not further limit a system structure. Where in the system does the sequencing occur? What is required to perform the sequencing? A hardware element? A software element? A scientist?

The metes and bounds of claim 38 are entirely unclear. How can an infection be identified before it occurs? It may be able to be predicted, but it can't be identified until it exists. Applicant arguments are not persuasive. The term "outbreak" is not limited no mean more than one patient.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 10-14, 16, 17, 21-27, 32-36, 38, 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CDC plan 1998, in view of Frothingham (1998).

Art Unit: 1631

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. Applicant alleges the Examiner builds on impermissible hindsight, and alleges an improper state of the art at the time the invention was made. These arguments are not persuasive. Applicant argues there is no express motivation to combine the cited references, however, such an express motivation is not required in a determination of obviousness. Motivation to combine prior art references may exist in the nature of the problem to be solved (Ruiz at 1276, 69 USPQ2d at 1690) or the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art (National Steel Car v. Canadian Pacific Railway Ltd., 357 F.3d 1319, 1338, 69 USPQ2d 1641, 1656 (Fed. Cir. 2004)). See MPEP § 2143.01. Applicant argues many limitations which are not present in the pending claims, and provides no evidence that one of skill in the art would not have considered the combination of references cited. Applicant's arguments cannot take the place of evidence. MPEP 2129 and 2144.03.

The rejection clearly sets forth the state of the art at the time the invention was made. The rejection states the conclusions and suggestions of the CDC plan 1998 in combination with the conclusions and suggestions of Frothingham (1998). The CDC plan clearly sets forth that newly discovered methods of identification of specific bacteria are to be incorporated and added to the existing system for tracking and controlling outbreaks of infection. Frothingham clearly identifies their method as being superior for identifying the specific type of bacteria, through methods meeting the limitations of the rejected claims.

CDC Plan "Preventing Emerging Infectious Diseases; a strategy for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, October, 1998" discloses methods of tracking and controlling infectious diseases. The document discloses Surveillance, and Response, Prevention and Control. Diseases of varying types including infectious diseases, foodborne diseases, airborne and zoonotic diseases, and diseases of travelers are all discussed. The Centers for Disease Control is an agency comprised of many elements, such as the National Center for Infectious Disease which can process patient samples and provide data. The CDC is linked to state and local health departments (which can obtain samples) comprising medical professionals, and to research facilities which comprise scientific personnel. Page 14 of the disclosure is a summary of the CDC plan. Surveillance is defined as "the ongoing systematic collection, analysis interpretation and dissemination of health data... Epidemiologists use these data to detect outbreaks; characterize disease transmission patterns by time, place and person; evaluate prevention and control programs and project future

Art Unit: 1631

health care needs.” (page 17). The collection of samples meets step (1) of the method. The analysis and interpretation encompasses steps (2-4) of the method. Detecting the outbreak and characterization meet the limitations of steps (5 and 6) and the dissemination meets the “warning” step of the claimed method. The FoodNet is an illustration of a system with a centralized database which performs the disclosed method. The FoodNet collects data obtained from patient specimens, compares and tracks the data. The FoodNet can provide warnings as to infection spread or outbreak. EMERGENCYIDNET, IDSA EIN, WHO Polio Lab Network, and GeoSentinel are other networked systems for tracking and controlling infections. The patient specimens can be obtained from Emergency departments, Infectious Disease Practicioners, and Clinics. Objects (food) and Object locations (place of manufacture, or sale, or consumption) as well as patient locations can all be tested and/or tracked. Issues of patient confidentiality are discussed. Samples are compared against local and international data. Warnings are specifically noted in the GeoSentinel summary as “travel advisories”.

The CDC Plan specifically indicates that molecular fingerprinting techniques are to be used to distinguish between strains or isolates of bacteria, fungi viruses or parasites. M. tuberculosis is a specifically contemplated infection. Methods used include comparing sequences and comparing the sizes of fragments. These tests are to be performed on patient samples, as well as objects and/or locations such as water supplies, food shipments, infected animals, etc. This plan creates a “real-time, on-line” capacity to identify and compare certain strains of bacteria. Particular subsystems specified by this plan include geographic information systems and computer programs that detect subtle variations of surveillance data that may indicate disease outbreaks. Early Warning systems are also disclosed to disseminate information on a wide scale.

At page 27, the plan specifically encourages the development of new diagnostic testing methods. The creation of tools for the collection and analysis of risk factor data, geographic information systems and remote sensing technologies and specifically disclosed.

The CDC Plan does not disclose the sequencing of the VNTR (Variable Number of Tandem Repeats) regions of the bacteria in the samples.

Frothingham et al. (1998, PTO-1449) discloses methods of assessing genetic diversity of a pathogen through the sequencing of the VNTR region of the pathogen. Frothingham et al.

Art Unit: 1631

obtain patient samples and sequence the VNTR region of the pathogen *M. Tuberculosis*. Primers are used to amplify the VNTR, then its size and sequence are determined. Comparison of the presence, size and sequence of these regions between samples provided a measure of diversity. Numbers of direct repeat sequences, the level of insertion or the level of deletion can be determined. Multiple distinct strains were identified and discriminated. The methods were determined to be stable and reproducible. Frothingham specifically notes that this procedure can be used in strain differentiation for diagnosis of infection and evolutionary studies. Other considered uses are epidemiological investigation, identification of outbreak-related strains and recognition of cross contamination. This method is an improvement over prior diagnostic techniques such as molecular fingerprinting. The previous art recognized standard, the molecular fingerprinting test, for *M Tuberculosis* had poor discriminatory power.

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the VNTR sequencing of Frothingham in the CDC Plan for controlling and tracking infection. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the methods of Frothingham, as they were shown to be an improvement over known techniques. The improved discrimination between types of a pathogen allow for more specific identification of the etiology of an outbreak, and better tracking of specific related infections. The high level of one of skill in the art of microbiology and medicine indicate that the methods could have reasonably been performed. One of skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success at combining the methods of Frothingham with the CDC Plan, as the CDC Plan specifically provides for the incorporation of new specific diagnostic testing. Therefore the entire invention, as a whole, would have been *prima facie* obvious, absent evidence to the contrary.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-14, 16, 17, 21-36, 38 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CDC plan 1998, in view of Van Belkum (1998).

Claim 7 specifies that the method tests for VNTR in the Protein A or coagulase genes of *S Aureus*. Claims 28-31 add multiple region sequencing.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. Applicant alleges the Examiner builds on impermissible hindsight, and alleges an improper state of the art

Art Unit: 1631

at the time the invention was made. These arguments are not persuasive. Applicant argues there is no express motivation to combine the cited references, however, such an express motivation is not required in a determination of obviousness. Motivation to combine prior art references may exist in the nature of the problem to be solved (Ruiz at 1276, 69 USPQ2d at 1690) or the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art (National Steel Car v. Canadian Pacific Railway Ltd., 357 F.3d 1319, 1338, 69 USPQ2d 1641, 1656 (Fed. Cir. 2004)). See MPEP § 2143.01. Applicant argues many limitations which are not present in the pending claims, and provides no evidence that one of skill in the art would not have considered the combination of references cited. Applicant's arguments cannot take the place of evidence. MPEP 2129 and 2144.03. The rejection clearly sets forth the state of the art at the time the invention was made. The rejection states the conclusions and suggestions of the CDC plan 1998 in combination with the conclusions and suggestions of Van Belkum (1998). The CDC plan clearly sets forth that newly discovered methods of identification of specific bacteria are to be incorporated and added to the existing system for tracking and controlling outbreaks of infection. Van Belkum clearly identifies their method as being superior for identifying the specific type of bacteria, through methods meeting the limitations of the rejected claims.

CDC Plan "Preventing Emerging Infectious Diseases; a strategy for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, October, 1998" discloses methods of tracking and controlling infectious diseases. The document discloses Surveillance, and Response, Prevention and Control. Diseases of varying types including infectious diseases, foodborne diseases, airborne and zoonotic diseases, and diseases of travelers are all discussed. The Centers for Disease Control is an agency comprised of many elements, such as the National Center for Infectious Disease which can process patient samples and provide data. The CDC is linked to state and local health departments (which can obtain samples) comprising medical professionals, and to research facilities which comprise scientific personnel. Page 14 of the disclosure is a summary of the CDC plan. Surveillance is defined as "the ongoing systematic collection, analysis interpretation and dissemination of health data... Epidemiologists use these data to detect outbreaks; characterize disease transmission patterns by time, place and person; evaluate prevention and control programs and project future health care needs." (page 17). The collection of samples meets step (1) of the method. The analysis and interpretation encompasses steps (2-4) of the method. Detecting the outbreak and

Art Unit: 1631

characterization meet the limitations of steps (5 and 6) and the dissemination meets the "warning" step of the claimed method. The FoodNet is an illustration of a system with a centralized database which performs the disclosed method. The FoodNet collects data obtained from patient specimens, compares and tracks the data. The FoodNet can provide warnings as to infection spread or outbreak. EMERGENCYIDNET, IDSA EIN, WHO Polio Lab Network, and GeoSentinel are other networked systems for tracking and controlling infections. The patient specimens can be obtained from Emergency departments, Infectious Disease Practitioners, and Clinics. Objects (food) and Object locations (place of manufacture, or sale, or consumption) as well as patient locations can all be tested and/or tracked. Issues of patient confidentiality are discussed. Samples are compared against local and international data. Warnings are specifically noted in the GeoSentinel summary as "travel advisories".

The CDC Plan specifically indicates that molecular fingerprinting techniques are to be used to distinguish between strains or isolates of bacteria, fungi viruses or parasites. S Aureus, and M tuberculosis are specifically contemplated infections. Methods used include comparing sequences and comparing the sizes of fragments. These tests are to be performed on patient samples, as well as objects and/or locations such as water supplies, food shipments, infected animals, etc. This plan creates a "real-time, on-line" capacity to identify and compare certain strains of bacteria. Particular subsystems specified by this plan include geographic information systems and computer programs that detect subtle variations of surveillance data that may indicate disease outbreaks. Early Warning systems are also disclosed to disseminate information on a wide scale.

At page 27, the plan specifically encourages the development of new diagnostic testing methods. The creation of tools for the collection and analysis of risk factor data, geographic information systems and remote sensing technologies and specifically disclosed.

The CDC Plan does not disclose the sequencing of the VNTR (Variable Number of Tandem Repeats) regions of the bacteria in the samples, or to perform this particular analysis on the protein A or coagulase genes of S Aureus.

Van Belkum (SSR Loci in Prokaryotic Genomes; MMBR 1998 62:275-293; PTO 1449) discloses methods of assessing genetic diversity of a pathogen through the sequencing of the VNTR region of the pathogen. Van Belkum obtain patient samples and sequence the VNTR

Art Unit: 1631

region of the protein A gene and/or coagulase gene of *S. Aureus*. (see pages 283-284.). Primers can be used to amplify the VNTR, then its size and sequence are determined. Comparison of the presence, size and sequence of these regions between samples can provide a measure of diversity. Numbers of direct repeat sequences, the level of insertion or the level of deletion can be determined. Multiple distinct strains were identified and discriminated. The methods were determined to be stable and reproducible. Van Belkum specifically notes that this procedure can be used in strain differentiation for diagnosis of infection and evolutionary studies. The coagulase is a major phenotypic species determinant in *S. Aureus*. Van Belkum notes that repeat elements enable bacteria to respond to diverse environmental factors, which appear to be related to pathogenesis, and these elements are extremely important in the study of adaptive behavior. Van Belkum note the successful use of PCR mediated SSR amplification, followed by size study and using sequencing for the pathogens of *H. influenzae* and *C. albicans*. These repeats lend themselves to the development of novel assays suited for strain identification and definition of strain relatedness.

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the repeat sequence region sequencing of Van Belkum in the CDC Plan for controlling and tracking infection. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the methods of Van Belkum, as they were shown to be an improvement over known techniques. The improved discrimination between types of a pathogen allow for more specific identification of the etiology of an outbreak, and better tracking of specific related infections. The high level of one of skill in the art of microbiology and medicine indicate that the methods could have reasonably been performed. One of skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success at combining the methods of Van Belkum with the CDC Plan, as the CDC Plan specifically provides for the incorporation of new specific diagnostic testing. Therefore the entire invention, as a whole, would have been *prima facie* obvious, absent evidence to the contrary.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1631

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary K Zeman whose telephone number is (571) 272 0723

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Wang can be reached on (571) 272 0811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571 273 8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

  
MARY K. ZEMAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
11/5/07



# **EXHIBIT B**



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
**Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS**  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

RECEIVED  
APR 13 2007  
BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

BL \_\_\_\_\_  
 Action \_\_\_\_\_  
 Due Date 7/22/07  
 Case 1010157  
 Docketed 7/12/07


# EXHIBIT C

09/656,084

System and method for tracking and controlling infections

04-16-

2007::17:40:24



**This application is officially maintained in electronic form. To View: Click the desired Document Description. To Download and Print: Check the desired document(s) and click Start Download.**

### Available Documents

	Document Description	Page Count
02-12-2007	<b>Mail returned to USPTO as undelivered</b>	<b>12</b>
02-05-2007	Final Rejection	11
09-28-2006	Transmittal to TC	1
09-28-2006	Fee Worksheet (PTO-06)	1
09-28-2006	Extension of Time	1
09-28-2006	Claims	12
09-28-2006	Applicant Arguments/Remarks Made in an Amendment	11
09-28-2006	Amendment - After Non-Final Rejection	1
03-28-2006	Search information including classification, databases and other search related notes	1
03-28-2006	Non-Final Rejection	10
03-28-2006	NPL Documents	74
03-28-2006	List of references cited by examiner	1
03-28-2006	List of References cited by applicant and considered by examiner	1
03-28-2006	Bibliographic Data Sheet	1
02-17-2006	Examiner's search strategy and results	3
01-12-2006	NPL Documents	5
01-12-2006	NPL Documents	8
01-12-2006	NPL Documents	6
01-12-2006	NPL Documents	6
01-12-2006	Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) Filed	5
11-28-2005	Miscellaneous Incoming Letter	2
11-28-2005	Extension of Time	1
11-28-2005	Appeal Brief Filed	45
06-28-2005	Notice of Appeal Filed	3
03-28-2005	Search information including classification, databases and other search related notes	1
03-28-2005	Final Rejection	22
01-03-2005	Supplemental Response or Supplemental Amendment	2
01-03-2005	Fee Worksheet (PTO-06)	1
01-03-2005	Claims	12
01-03-2005	Applicant Arguments/Remarks Made in an Amendment	16
12-03-2004	Examiner Interview Summary Record (PTOL - 413)	3
10-14-2004	Transmittal to TC	1
10-14-2004	Fee Worksheet (PTO-06)	1
10-14-2004	Extension of Time	2
10-14-2004	Claims	12
10-14-2004	Applicant Arguments/Remarks Made in an Amendment	11
10-14-2004	Amendment - After Non-Final Rejection	1
04-14-2004	Search information including classification, databases and other search related notes	1
04-14-2004	Non-Final Rejection	13
04-14-2004	List of references cited by examiner	1
04-14-2004	List of References cited by applicant and considered by examiner	1
02-13-2004	Fee Worksheet (PTO-06)	1
02-11-2004	Transmittal to TC	2
02-11-2004	Request for Continued Examination (RCE)	1
02-11-2004	NPL Documents	4
02-11-2004	NPL Documents	11
02-11-2004	NPL Documents	19